



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

21

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,522	03/01/2004	Seth M. Demsey	MS306914.01 / MSFTP571US	9910
27195 7590 10/10/2007 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER FATEHI, PARHAM R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2194				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/10/2007		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/790,522

**Applicant(s)**

DEMSEY ET AL.

**Examiner**

Parham (Paul) R. Fatehi

**Art Unit**

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 & 27-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040624.

WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
4) ☐ Information Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-25 & 27-40 are pending in this application.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/24/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 4 recites "response to the callback to transmitted to the destination" and is awkwardly worded. Appropriate correction is required.

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 27-40 should be renumbered to 26-39.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2194

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 9-11 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood (US 6,523,027).

As per claim 1, Underwood discloses a system that facilitates a performance enhancement in message-based computing, comprising a performance-based interface across which a request from a source is transmitted to a destination (col. 11, ln 40-46, a interface with request between source and destination); and a filter component in communication with the destination that dynamically allows only one or more relevant responses from the destination to transition the interface to the source (Underwood, Detailed Description Par. 3011, dynamic filter).

Underwood does not explicitly disclose that the interface is performance-based. One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made would have recognized it as common sense that the interface that increases speed and software quality, as taught by Underwood, implicitly improves performance.

As per claim 5, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed and further teaches the filter component is integrated into an operating system (Underwood, col. 8, ln 17-35, operating system).

As per claim 9, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed and further teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out (Underwood, col. 17, ln 25-30, computer readable storage).

Art Unit: 2194

As per claim 10, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed and further teaches computer that employs the system (Underwood, see Background).

As per claim 11, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed and further teaches a server that employs the system (Underwood, col. 1, ln 47-50, server).

As per claims 16-18, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed and further teaches the source utilizes reflection during initialization of an object to determine the presence of a custom object; the source utilizes reflection during initialization of an object to determine if message handling has been modified in a custom object; the source utilizes type introspection to determine the presence of a custom object, in response to which the destination is notified that a message associated with the custom object is of interest and will be forwarded from the destination for a lifetime of the custom object (Underwood, Detailed Description, Par. 66, custom object).

Claims 2-3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Meijer et al (US 7,219,329) [hereafter Meijer].

As per claims 2-3, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed but fails to further teach that the source comprises at least one of native code and managed code, and the destination comprises at least one of native code and managed code.

Whereas, Meijer teaches the source comprises one of native code and managed code. One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made would have considered it a common design choice to use either of native code or managed code as the logic background of the source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2194

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer.

As per claim 15, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer substantially disclose the invention as claimed and further disclose the source can dynamically inspect at least one of properties, methods, and events implemented on a source object (Meijer, col. 3, ln 5-30, dynamic inspection).

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Ahmed et al (US 6,647,432) [hereafter Ahmed].

As per claim 4, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed but fails to further disclose the destination issues a callback to the source, in response the filter component permits only a relevant response to the callback to transmitted to the destination.

Whereas, Ahmed teaches disclosing the destination issues a callback to the source, in response the filter component permits only a relevant response to the callback to transmitted to the destination (Ahmed, col. 29, ln 61 – col. 30, ln 10). One having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have combined the teachings of Underwood in view of Ahmed in order to enable verification of responses in the system.

As per claim 14, the teachings of Underwood in view of Ahmed substantially disclose the invention as claimed and further disclose that the filter component is notified by the source when an event handler has attached to or detached from a source

Art Unit: 2194

object, and forwards the one or more responses only when the associated event handlers are attached (Ahmed, see Detailed Description, Par. 322, handler object).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Moakley et al (US 2005/0050545) [hereafter Moakley].

As per claim 6, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed but fails to further teach the system is employed in a small footprint execution environment that has reduced resources.

Whereas, Moakley teaches a footprint environment in an enterprise system (Moakley, see Par. 18). One having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have combined the teachings of Underwood to include a footprint environment as taught by Moakley in order to reduce costs and achieve greater scalability by reducing the need for resources.

Claims 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Elliot et al (US 2002/0064149) [hereafter Elliot].

As per claim 7, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed but fails to further teach that the source is part of a managed code framework that includes a graphical user interface (GUI) application that transmits an event for processing by the destination, which destination is part of native code.

Whereas, Elliot teaches source is part of a managed code framework that includes a GUI that transmits event for processing (Elliot, Par. 2068 & Par. 2130). One having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made would have combined the teachings of Underwood to include a framework that includes a GUI as taught by

Art Unit: 2194

Elliot, in order to create a system that efficiently manages event calls in a user-friendly format.

As per claims 12 and 13, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed and further teaches the source is associated with a GUI such that the request receives only the one or more responses from a graphics/windowing/events system that are relevant to the request (Elliot, Par. 2068 & Par. 2130); the source notifies a native layer that an event handler has attached or detached (Elliot, Par. 3497, event handler).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Elliot (US 7,145,898).

As per claim 8, Underwood substantially teaches the invention as claimed but fails to further teach a classifier that makes an inference about processes that can be automatically performed.

Whereas, Elliot teaches controlling event actions automatically. One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made would have combined the teachings of Underwood with a classifier/controlling mechanism as taught by Elliot in order to add greater self-sufficiency and user-friendliness to the system by automatically taking action without user input.

Claims 19-20, 22, 27-36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Meijer and further in view of Elliot (2002/0064149).

As per claims 19-20 and 22, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer substantially disclose the invention as claimed and further teach a system that facilitates



a performance enhancement in message-based computing a performance-based interface between the managed code framework and the native code framework across which the request is passed and the one or more responses are transmitted (Underwood, col. 11, ln 40-46 & Detailed Description Par 3011); and a filter component in communication with the native code framework that dynamically allows only one or more relevant responses of the native code framework to transition the interface to the managed code framework (Meijer, col. 1, ln 64-col. 2, ln. 5, managed code and native code).

Underwood in view of Meijer fail to further disclose a managed code framework that generates a request and a native code framework that receives the request and issues one or more responses thereto. Whereas, Elliot further discloses a managed code framework that generates a request and a native code framework that receives the request and issues one or more responses thereto (Elliot, Par. 2068 & 2130). One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made would have combined the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer to include a managed code framework that generates a native code framework, as taught by Elliot, in order to allow more efficient interconnection of the communication network.

As per claims 27-29, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and further in view of Elliot substantially teach the invention as claimed and further teach the managed code framework source utilizes type introspection during initialization of an object to determine the presence of a custom object; the managed code framework utilizes type introspection during initialization of an object to determine if message

Art Unit: 2194

handling has been modified in a custom object; the managed code framework utilizes type introspection to determine the presence of a custom object, in response to which the native code framework is notified that a message associated with the custom object is of interest and will be forwarded from the native code framework for a lifetime of the custom object (Underwood, Detailed Description, Par. 66, custom object).

As per claim 30, the apparatus claim recites the same limitations as the system in claim 19 above and is rejected under the same reasons as claim 19.

As per claim 31, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and further in view of Elliot substantially teach the invention as claimed and further teach the act of filtering occurs on the destination side of the interface (Underwood, col. 11, ln 40-46, filtering).

As per claim 32, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and further in view of Elliot substantially teach the invention as claimed. Refer to the rejections of claims 19 and 30 above.

As per claim 33, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and further in view of Elliot substantially teach the invention as claimed. Refer to the rejections of claims 19, 30 and 32 above.

As per claim 34 and 36, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and further in view of Elliot substantially teach the invention as claimed and further teach tracking the attached event with the native code (Elliot, Par. 2068 & Par. 2130, tracking).

As per claim 35 and 39, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and further in view of Elliot substantially teach the invention as claimed. Refer to the rejections of claims 19 and 27-29 above.

Art Unit: 2194

Claims 21, 23-25, 37-38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Meijer and Elliot and further in view of Ahmed et al (US 6,647,432) [hereafter Ahmed].

As per claim 21, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and Elliot, substantially disclose the invention as claimed but fails to further disclose the filter component only allows the one or more responses across the interface that are relevant to the request.

Whereas, Ahmed discloses relevant response requests (col. 29, In 61-col. 30, In 10, only relevant responses called back). One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made would have modified the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and Elliot, to include the method of response relevancy as taught by Ahmed in order to add a method of checking to the system.

As per claim 23, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and Elliot and further in view of Ahmed, substantially disclose the invention and further disclose a managed code filter component that is part of the managed code framework, which managed code filter processes a callback from the native code framework and only forwards responses from the managed code to the native code that are relevant to the callback (Ahmed, col 29, In 61 – col 30, In 10, only relevant responses are called back).

As per claims 24 and 37, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and Elliot and further in view of Ahmed, substantially disclose the invention and further disclose the filter component only processes events that are registered (Ahmed, Detailed Description, Par 322).

Art Unit: 2194

As per claims 25 and 38, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and Elliot and further in view of Ahmed, substantially disclose the invention and further disclose that the filter component is notified by the managed code framework when an event handler has at least one of registered and unregistered from a managed object, and forwards the one or more responses only when the associated event handlers are registered (Ahmed, col. 29, ln 61 – col 30, ln 10, only relevant responses called back).

As per claim 40, the teachings of Underwood in view of Meijer and Elliot and further in view of Ahmed, substantially disclose the invention as claimed. It is rejected under the same reasons as claim 25 above.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Parham (Paul) R. Fatehi whose telephone number is 571-270-1407. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30AM-8PM EST, off Fridays.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571)272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Fatehi  
AU 2194

  
9/27/2007

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER